#### **REMARKS**

## **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 7-8, 14-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Hiraishi et al.</u> (US, 6, 538,759).

Claims 3-5, 10-12, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Hiraishi et al</u>.

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraishi et al. and further in view of Bloomquist et al. (US 6,594,034).

Claims 6 and 13 are indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

## Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicants amend independent claims 1, 8, 15, 20-23 and dependent claims 16-17, and 19 to further define the invention, and amend dependent claim 5 to correct the minor informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are presently pending.

#### All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 7-8, 14-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Hiraishi et al.</u> (US, 6, 538,759); claims 3-5, 10-12, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Hiraishi et al.</u>; and claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Hiraishi et al.</u> and further in view of <u>Bloomquist et al.</u> (US 6,594,034). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims at least for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 21-23, as amended, all recite an image processing device, including in part, "the output image data generation unit waits to send the output image data to an image formation device until the recognition unit completes the recognition process."

Similarly, independent claim 8, as amended, recites an image processing method, including in part, "delivery of the output image data to an image formation device is waited until the recognizing process is completed." In addition, independent claim 15, as amended, recites a function for recognizing a specific image, including in part, "delivery of the output image data to an image formation device is waited until the recognizing process is completed." Furthermore, independent claim 20, as amended recites, an image processing device, including in part, "when the recognition unit recognizes the specific image, the generation or output of the output image data is stopped, even if the recognition process on an entirety of the converted recognition image data has not complete." Applicants respectfully submit at least these features of independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 21-23 are neither taught nor suggested by Hiraishi et al. and Bloomquist et al., whether taken singly or combined.

The Office Action alleges that <u>Hiraishi et al.</u> discloses a recognition unit that performs a recognition process to recognize a specific image from the converted recognition image data, wherein the output image data generation unit is adapted to wait until the recognition unit completes the recognition process for performing an image process subsequent to the generation process (col. 5, line 52 to col. 7, line 30, items 11, 16 and 18 in FIG. 1). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, <u>Hiraishi et al.</u> teaches, col. 6 line 63 to col. 7, line 9, an image processing method for detecting the non-reproducible image that utilizes the "image processing section 11" (i.e., output image data generation unit 14) which begins delivering the output image data to the engine section (i.e. image formation device) without receiving a confirmation from the "recognition section 15" (i.e. recognition unit 18).

Accordingly, at least the first page of forged document is printed. On the other hand,

Applicants' invention is adapted to determine the presence of specific image (i.e., forged image) before any output image data is delivered to the image forming device (i.e., printer), thus allowing the image processing device to prevent printing of even the first page of forged document.

As pointed out in MPEP §2131, '[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

\*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that since Hiraishi et al. fails to teach or suggest every element of at least independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 20-23, then Hiraishi et al. fails to anticipate at least independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 20-23, and hence dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-19.

Furthermore, Applicants assert that the Office Action does not rely on Bloomquist et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Hiraishi et al. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Bloomquist et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Hiraishi et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applies references, whether taken alone or in combination.

# **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: April 11, 2005

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004 Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001